



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/743,540	12/23/2003	Hideki Sunaga	074418-0127	5786	
22428	7590	10/05/2005	EXAMINER		
FOLEY AND LARDNER				HIRUY, ELIAS	
SUITE 500				ART UNIT	
3000 K STREET NW				PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20007				2837	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EX

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/743,540	Applicant(s) SUNAGA ET AL.
Examiner Elias B. Hiruy	Art Unit 2837

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 9,13-21,23,26 and 30-38.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 6-8,10,12,22,24,25 and 27-29.


Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-5.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____



DAVID MARTIN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The amendment after final rejection filed on 09/13/05 has been entered. After thoroughly reviewing the amendment and applicant argument, the argument and remarks did not overcome the final rejection as stated in the previous office action. Regarding the independent claim 6, the applicant argued that the intent of claim 6 is directed at solving the problem of noise generated by gear backlash, and argued to show that the references used do not teach the intent of the applicant except Coles. The cited limitation in the argument shows a difference between the specification of the prior art and the specification of the present application. Applicant is reminded that even though the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re van Geuns*, 988 F. 2d 1181, 26 USPQ2D 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Thus, the claims as claimed are not patentably distinguishable from the prior art and have failed to overcome the rejection set forth in the earlier office action.

Further, it is known in the art of motor control to adopt motor techniques of similar motors (a DC motor control method or an AC motor control method) from the different applications as the intent is to efficiently control the motor. Thus, the applicant argument stating lack of motivation for combining the references used in the final rejection is not persuasive enough.